



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,730	10/30/2003	Chin-Kuan Lou	3304.2.97	7715

21552 7590 02/23/2006

MADSON & AUSTIN
GATEWAY TOWER WEST
SUITE 900
15 WEST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101

EXAMINER

TRINH, SONNY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2687

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/697,730

Applicant(s)

LOU, CHIN-KUAN

Examiner

Sonny TRINH

Art Unit

2687

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed on 08/13/04 has been considered and placed in the application file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1-15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ha et al. (hereinafter "Ha"; U.S. Patent number 6,530,838 B2) in view of Chu-Chia et al. (hereinafter "Chu-Chia"; U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0142799 A1).

Regarding **claim 1**, with reference to figures 1-3 and descriptions (please see summary of the invention in column 1 line 50 to column 2 line 21 and columns 3-4), Ha discloses a command input device (figure 1, game-pad 10), and a portable communication apparatus (figure 1, PDA 30), comprising:

a signal connector detachably plugged to a socket of said portable communication apparatus (figure 1, connector 33); and

a command generator electrically connected to said signal connector (figure 3, keys 32, 12).

However, Ha does not explicitly disclose that the system is for use with a digital data processing system and asserting a command signal to said digital data processing system via local wireless transmission modules of said portable communication apparatus and said digital data processing system.

In an analogous art, Chu-Chia discloses a Personal Digital Assistant for connecting with a communications module (abstract). Chu-Chia further discloses that the PDA can be used to communicate with other digital data processing system such as PC or PDA (via a wireless connection (paragraph [0034])).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to incorporate the wireless connection as taught by Chu-Chia, to the system of Ha. The motivation for doing so would be to provide wireless link communication and freedom from wires.

Regarding **claim 2**, Chu-Chia further discloses that the local wireless transmission modules of said portable communication apparatus and said digital data processing system are bluetooth transmitters (paragraph [0035]).

Regarding **claim 4**, Ha further disclose that the command generator is a game pad module (figures 1, 3, column 1 line 50 to column 2 line 21).

Regarding **claim 6**, Chu-Chia further discloses that said digital data processing system is one of a personal computer (paragraph [0035]).

Regarding **claim 7**, Ha further disclose said portable communication apparatus is a personal digital assistant (figures 1, 3, PDA 30).

Regarding **claims 3 and 5**, the combination of Ha and Chu-Chia discloses the invention but does not explicitly disclose that the command generator obtains electrical power from said portable communication apparatus via said signal connector nor the signal connector is a universal serial bus (USB) connector.

However, universal serial bus (USB) connector are well known and widely used standard for its capability of not only providing a connection but also supplying power to the peripheral devices and the Examiner takes Official notice of such popular connector. The motivation for using an USB connector is to adhere to a standard and also supplying power to the connected devices.

Regarding **claims 8-10, 13, 15**, these claims merely reflect the system claims as opposed to the apparatus claim of claims 1-2, 7, 5, 4 (respectively) and are therefore rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 11**, Ha further discloses that command input device is combined with said portable communication apparatus via a signal connector (figures 1-2, connectors 33 and 17).

Regarding **claim 12**, this claim merely reflects the system claims as opposed to the apparatus claim of claim 3 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 14**, the combination of Ha and Chu-Chia discloses the invention including the integration of a game-pad with key control with a PDA but does not explicitly disclose that said command input device is disposed on the housing with said

Art Unit: 2687

portable communication apparatus. However, it would have been obvious and well within the level of an ordinary skill in the art to combine both the key control with the portable communication apparatus for the obvious reason of having a single unit that is not likely to be separated for the convenience of the user.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. **Claims 16-17, 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Glover (U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0054856 A1).

Regarding **claim 16**, with reference to figures 1,3, 4-5 and descriptions, Glover discloses a portable communication apparatus for use with a base station and a digital data processing system (paragraphs [0027] – [0029]), comprising:

a first local wireless transmission module (figure 6, transceiver 430); and

a command generator electrically connected to said first wireless transmission module and asserting a command signal to said digital data processing system via said first local wireless transmission module wherein said command signal is a data input signal (from keyboard module 420 or 520 of figures 4-5).

Regarding **claim 17**, Glover further teaches that the command signal transmitted from said first local wireless transmission module is received by a second local wireless

transmission module of said digital data processing system (paragraphs [0027] – [0033]).

Regarding **claim 20**, Glover further teaches that the command generator is keyboard module (figures 4-5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claim 18** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glover (U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0054856 A1) in view of Chu-Chia et al. (hereinafter “Chu-Chia”; U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0142799 A1).

Regarding **claim 18**, Glover discloses the invention but does not disclose that said first and said second local wireless transmission modules are bluetooth transmitters, bluetooth receivers, or bluetooth transceivers.

In an analogous art, Chu-Chia discloses a Personal Digital Assistant for connecting with a communications module (abstract). Chu-Chia further discloses that the PDA can be used to communicate with other digital data processing system such as PC or PDA using Bluetooth protocol (via a wireless connection (paragraphs [0034] – [0035])).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Bluetooth connection as taught by Chu-Chia, to the system of Glover. The motivation for doing so would be to provide short range wireless link communication that is compatible to many access points.

5. **Claim 19** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glover (U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0054856 A1).

Regarding **claim 19**, Glover discloses the invention including the integration of a key control with a PDA (figures 1,3,4,5) but does not explicitly disclose that said command input device is disposed on the housing with said portable communication apparatus. However, it would have been obvious and well within the level of an ordinary skill in the art to combine both the key control with the portable communication apparatus for the obvious reason of having a single unit that is not likely to be separated for the convenience of the user.

CONCLUSION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sonny TRINH whose telephone number is 571-272-7927. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward URBAN can be reached on 571-272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

2/17/06


SONNY TRINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER